IN THE HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

Writ Petition No. 356 of 2006 (S/B)

Ranveer Singh Chauhan S/o Late Sri Meher Singh Chauhan,
Yantrik Upkaran Evam Bhandar Khand-first,
Yamuna Colony,
District Dehradun. ……. Petitioner

Versus

1. S.P. Goel S/o Late Sri Shyam Lal Goel,
   R/o Landhore Bazaar, Near Ghantaghar,
   Mussoorie, District Dehradun.
2. Public Services Tribunal, Uttaranchal,
   District Dehradun. ……. Respondents

Mr. Sharad Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. D.S. Mehta, Advocate on behalf of Mr. M.C. Pant, Advocate for respondent No. 1.
Mr. Nanak Chand Gupta, Standing Counsel for respondent No. 2.

JUDGMENT

Coram: Hon'ble Rajeev Gupta, C.J.
Hon'ble J.C.S. Rawat, J.

RAJEEV GUPTA, C. J. (Oral)

Mr. Sharad Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. D.S. Mehta, Advocate on behalf of Mr. M.C. Pant, Advocate for respondent No. 1.

Mr. Nanak Chand Gupta, Standing Counsel for respondent No. 2.

They are heard.

2. Petitioner Ranveer Singh Chauhan has filed this writ petition for the following reliefs:

> "I) Issue an appropriate direction to the State Government to grant approval for the payment 14% interest on the awarded amount in pursuance of the judgment of Public Services Tribunal dated 7.7.2004 as sought by the Superintending Engineer by his letter dated 26.6.2006 (Annexure No. 17 to the writ petition).

II) Issue an appropriate direction to the respondent no. 2 to drop the contempt proceedings drawn against the petitioner under Section 5-A of the Public Services Tribunal Act.

III) Issue a writ, order or direction, which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper under the circumstances of the case.

IV) Award the cost of the petition."

3. The petitioner is facing contempt proceedings before the Public Services Tribunal for non-compliance of the Tribunal's order dated 07.07.2004 passed in Claim Petition No. 4 of 2001 filed by respondent No. 1 S.P. Goel, wherein State of Uttaranchal was also one of the respondents.

4. We have no manner of doubt that the writ petition filed by the petitioner, in its present form, is not, at all, maintainable for the reliefs sought by the petitioner in the writ petition. The only course open to the petitioner is to file reply in the contempt proceedings before the Public Services Tribunal, if not already filed, and if an order is passed against him, to challenge the same in accordance with law.

5. The writ petition, therefore, is liable to be dismissed and is hereby dismissed.

6. Consequently, the interim order dated 14.08.2006 stands vacated automatically.

7. With the above order, CLMAs Nos. 10136 of 2006 and 15124 of 2006 also stand disposed of.

(J.C.S. Rawat, J.) **(Rajeev Gupta, C. J.)**

07.03.2007 07.03.2007

G